

### REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 7, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21 and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Chao et al. and further in view of Binstead, and claims 4-6, 17-18 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Harada in view of Chao et al. and Binstead and further in view of Keely et al.

In the detailed office action, the examiner admits that Harada Publication fails to teach “**electromagnetic induction layer including a wire lattice formed by a first wire winded along a first direction with longitudes across the display screen and a second wire winded along a second direction orthogonal to said first direction with latitudes across the display screen, said first and second wires being interlaced separately with longitudes crossing said latitudes**” of claim 1 but cites FIG. 1C and FIG. 2C of Chao Publication as having disclosed such limitations. Applicant would like to note that the winded wires of Chao have a completely different physical structure which relies on different working principles in comparison with the instant invention.

With reference to Figure 7 of the instant invention, as defined in the amended Claim 1 in the present application, the instant invention has **more than one electromagnetic induction layer being provided and overlaid one another, and each said electromagnetic induction layer including a wire lattice formed by a single first wire winded along a first direction with longitudes across the display screen and a single second wire winded along a second direction.** FIG. 7 clearly illustrates how the wire lattice is formed by one first wire and one second wire in each electromagnetic

induction layer.

As shown in FIG. 2C and described in paragraph [0027] of Chao publication, the layout of the antenna loop along the X-direction is formed by crossing the plurality of dummy closed regions 250A, 250B and 250C from each other with the interlacing methods, and along the Y-direction is formed by crossing the plurality of dummy closed sections 270A, 270B, and 270C from each other with the same method. More specifically, **the winded wire 200A does not form longitudes and the winded wire 200B does not form latitudes**. Both winded wires 200A and 200B are winded with unique and complex patterns that are completely different from the instant invention.

In Chao's antenna loop, there is a gap at the middle position of the long side of the rectangle. The antenna lattices are formed by interlacing the antenna loops of the X direction and the Y direction. However, when winding the antenna loops of the X direction or the Y direction, the antenna will be intercrossed at the middle position. Therefore, parts of the antenna lattices are not regular partitions and in the middle of the antenna lattice there are redundant antennae. And reference positions are not disclosed in the paragraph [0027] with Fig. 2C of Chao. However, claim 1 of the application provides the position reference columns arranged around said electromagnetic induction layers and the wire lattices formed by respective wire winding in the X direction and the Y direction. The wire lattices formed on the electromagnetic induction layer have regular partitions.

With reference to FIG. 1C and paragraph [0009] of Chao et al., antenna loops distributed along the X-direction and Y-direction of two-dimensional Cartesian coordinates are connected to a ground wire 105A and 105B respectively and **both**

**arrangement for layout of the antenna loops 110A and 110B overstep the ground wires 105A and 105B**, and thus, a predetermined space 170 requires being provided for placing the antenna loops 110A and 110B, which is located on the boundary region within conventional tablet. Therefore, it **is resulted in the limitation for scaling down area, and further, that is difficult to make the panel with a small boundary region** (excerpted from paragraph[0009]).

It is clear from the above excerption of Chao's publication and its FIG. 1C, the antenna arrangement disclosed in FIG. 1C is not **a wire lattice formed by a single first wire winded along a first direction with longitudes across the display screen and a single second wire winded along a second direction**. In each X or Y direction, FIG. 1C consists of many antenna loops 110A or 110B over step the ground wires, and there are many outputs which make it difficult to manufacture the panel with a small boundary region. There is absolutely no similarity between FIG. 1C of Chao et al. and FIG. 7 of the instant invention as claimed in the amended claim 1.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully contends that the amended claim 1 has distinctly defined the invention in a patentable way to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Harada in view of Chao et al. Furthermore, the amended claim 1 also recites that the touch control display screen comprises more than one electromagnetic induction layer overlaid one another which is not disclosed by any of the cited prior arts. Applicant respectfully submits that the amended claim 1 is allowable. By virtue of dependency, claims 4-7 and 15-23 should also be allowable.

The above amendment also presents a new claim 24 which specifically recites

that **the induction cells formed by the wire lattices on different electromagnetic induction layers have different sizes**. As mentioned in paragraph [0013] of the instant specification, the overlaid electromagnetic induction layers are interlaced with each other and the induction cell size of the wire lattice of each layer may be different. Therefore, the interval of the induction coordinate is reduced. Furthermore, the induction precision of the display screen is increased. And the design of multiple layers can avoid the technical difficulty that the interval between the parallel wires must be so close on a single electromagnetic induction layer to allow the increase of the induction precision of a touch screen display. None of the cited prior arts has taught or suggested such limitations. Applicant submits that claim 24 should be allowable.

From the foregoing discussion, it is evident that the instant invention differs from the cited prior arts. The physical difference results in different effects and is not obvious. Claims 1, 4-7, and 15-24 are in full condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Jason Z. Lin/

Jason Z. Lin  
Agent for Applicant  
Reg. No. 37,492  
Customer No. 33,804